

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

A. O., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-06151-SVK

**ORDER IN PREPARATION FOR  
HEARING ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION  
FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 10

The parties are set for hearing on Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction on March 24, 2020. Dkt. 10. In advance of the hearing, the Court identifies the following issues on which it would like the parties to focus:

1. The Court has considered carefully the cases of *White v. Lee*, 227 F.3d 1214 (9th Cir. 2000); *Rosebrock v. Mathis*, 745 F.3d 963 (9th Cir. 2014); and *Fikre v. Federal Bureau of Investigation*, 904 F.3d 1033 (9th Cir. 2018). How do the facts of the instant case compare with *White* and *Rosebrock*, and how should those comparisons guide this Court's decision?
2. Given that the class representatives' claims have been adjudicated, and in light of the current COVID-19 public health crisis, should the Court wait until the *J.L.* settlement is fully adjudicated to issue a decision on the instant motion?
3. If the Court finds that a preliminary injunction is warranted, what is the appropriate scope of the injunction, particularly, but not exclusively, with regards to an obligation on the Government to provide notification of an immigration action against any putative class member?

////

////

1           Additionally, in accordance with General Order 72, this hearing will be conducted  
2 telephonically. To ensure adequate connectivity, this hearing will be conducted via Court Call.  
3 Counsel are instructed to contact Court Call at 1-866-582-6878 to arrange for their telephonic  
4 appearances.

5           **SO ORDERED.**

6           Dated: March 18, 2020

7  
8           

9           SUSAN VAN KEULEN  
10           United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28